

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### - Amendments -

Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be amended as indicated in the accompanying amended page(s), in which:

- Claim 9 is newly added.

By these amendments, claims 1, 3 - 6, and 8 - 9 are pending. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

#### - Remarks -

##### Request for Reconsideration of Finality of Office Action

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the finality of the instant Office Action. Applicant believes that a new ground of rejection has been relied upon in the instant Office Action, which new ground was neither necessitated by an amendment by Applicant, nor based on information submitted in an IDS. Applicant has not had an opportunity to consider this new ground of rejection.

Applicant notes that in the previous Office Action dated 1 July 2008, at part 9, the Examiner refers to the embodiment of Suzuki depicted in Figs. 1 and 2 illustrating a print head assembly movable along a printing path (a→, ← b). In view of this reference to Suzuki, and further in view that the Examiner's rejection at page 5, last paragraph, stated only that "*Suzuki at least discloses a bubble jet type printhead that spans the width of the recording medium*" without specific reference to any particular portion of Suzuki allegedly disclosing this feature, Applicant understood the Examiner as asserting that the movement of the printhead assembly along printing path (a→, ← b) constituted the "spanning" feature of claim 1, in particular the "*at least one printhead integrated circuit substantially spanning a width of the printing path*".

Appropriate arguments were submitted by the Applicant in traverse of the above assertion, based on the Applicant's assumption of what feature of Suzuki the Examiner considered as teaching the feature of "spanning".

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner now refers to Suzuki at col. 16, lines 17-24, for support of the assertion that the “spanning” feature of claim 1 is taught by Suzuki. Applicant notes that this portion of Suzuki does not appear to have been mentioned in the previous Office Action, nor was this portion of Suzuki relied upon in the manner it is now. Applicant further notes that the Examiner no longer appears to be relying on the description of Suzuki regarding the movement of the printhead assembly along printing path (a→, ← b).

Applicant believes that the above new reliance on Suzuki at col. 16, lines 17 - 24, should be considered a new ground of rejection. In particular, it is submitted that the previous Office Action did not afford Applicant a reasonable opportunity to consider this the Examiner’s new construction and reliance of Suzuki.

Applicant sincerely desires the opportunity to consider and respond to the new interpretation of and reliance on Suzuki, and imposes on the Examiner to reconsider the finality of the instant Office Action in light of the above facts.

35 USC §103(a)

Independent claim 1 remains rejected under §103(a) over Suzuki (US 5,847,836) in view of Yuen (US 6,347,863). Applicant previously argued that the combination of Suzuki and Yuen failed to disclose an elongate ink reservoir assembly spanning a width of the printing path, and a printhead integrated circuit substantially spanning a width of the printing path.

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner refers to Suzuki at col. 16, lines 17 - 24, asserting that this portion of Suzuki discloses the above two features of claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that whilst the above portion of Suzuki may suggest a printhead integrated circuit spanning a width of the printing path, the above portion is silent as to an elongate ink reservoir assembly spanning a width of the printing path.

Col. 16, lines 17 - 24, describes only that “*a full line type printhead having a length corresponding to the width of a maximum printing medium... can be used*”. No mention is made of an elongate ink reservoir also spanning a width of the printing path.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, in reciting an elongate ink reservoir assembly spanning a width of the printing path, is not taught or suggested by the combination of Suzuki and Yuen.

**Claim 6 & Official Notice**

The Examiner rejects claim 6, contending that Sugitani et al. disclose the claimed air inlets. Applicant's review of Sugitani et al. suggests that Sugitani et al. is in fact silent as to any air inlets. Sugitani et al. appear to describe only liquid supply inlets and liquid discharging outlets.

Moreover, Sugitani et al. do not teach or suggest that the air inlets are defined in one of the end walls of the cover moulding of the ink reservoir.

Applicant acknowledge the Examiner's reliance on Official Notice, in particular with regard to the subject matter of claim 6. However, Applicant disagrees that treating air inlets to be hydrophobic is well known and expected in the art.

In the present invention, the air inlets (113 - 115) are defined in end walls of the reservoir, and the reservoirs directly contain the ink as opposed to the ink being stored in bags within the reservoir. The unintended egress of ink through the air inlets is therefore a concern.

Applicant disagrees that the claimed arrangement of hydrophobically treated air inlets is well known and expected. Conventional ink reservoirs have relied, for example, on maintaining negative reservoir pressure, flexible bags/membranes within the reservoirs, or even variable volume reservoirs, to either address the problem of unintended ink egression through air inlets, or to dispense entirely without needing air inlets.

Applicant respectfully requests documentary evidence in support of the above Official Notice. Applicant regrets the inconvenience caused to the Examiner.

**Other Amendments**

New claim 9, dependent from claim 3, is added. New claim 9 recites that the guide assembly includes a first guide wall extending from a first inner wall, and a second guide wall extending from a second inner wall, the first and second guide walls extending towards each

other from the first and second inner walls respectively and terminating at the elongate opening.

The combination of Suzuki and Yuen (and in particular Yuen - Fig. 3), fails to teach or suggest this feature. Yuen fails to disclose a first and second guide wall extending towards each other from respective first and second inner walls, and terminating at an elongate opening.

Favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and remarks is respectfully requested. Applicant looks forward to word of further official communication in due course.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



---

Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762